



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,013	04/08/2004	Paquita Erazo-Majewicz	10304	9303

7590 03/14/2007  
Hercules Incorporated  
Hercules Plaza  
1313 North Market Street  
Wilmington, DE 19894-0001

EXAMINER
----------

MRUK, BRIAN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1751

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/14/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/821.013

**Applicant(s)**

ERAZO-MAJEWICZ ET AL.

**Examiner**

**Brian P. Mruk**

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-76 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 46-62 and 76 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 and 63-75 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/21/06 & 9/1/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Claims 1-45 and 63-75 in the reply filed on January 3, 2007 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 46-62 and 76 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on January 3, 2007.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 17 and 20 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Specifically, the MW lower limit recited in claim 17 and the MW upper limit recited in claim 20 are already recited in claim 1, and thus, both claims 17 and 20 fail to further limit claim 1.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1751

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-45 and 63-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Erazo-Majewicz et al, US 2003/0211952.

Art Unit: 1751

Erazo-Majewicz et al, US 2003/0211952, discloses a personal care or household care composition comprising a cationic polygalactomannan, such as guar and locust bean, that has a molecular weight lower limit of 5,000 and an upper limit of 200,000, and an aldehyde functionality content of at least 0.01 meq/gram (see abstract and paragraphs [0022]-[0025]). It is further taught by Erazo-Majewicz et al that the cationic moiety includes quaternary ammonium compounds, such as 3-chloro-2-hydroxypropyltrimethylammonium chloride (see paragraphs [0027]-[0028]), per the requirement of claim 16, and that the composition contains adjunct ingredients typically found in personal and household care products (see paragraphs [0055]-[0111]), per the requirements of instant claims 36-45 and 63-75. Specifically, note Tables 1-11 and Examples 1-15, which disclose compositions containing adjunct ingredients, water, and cationic polygalactomannans that meet the molecular weight, aldehyde functionality content, viscosity, and cationic degree of substitution requirements of the instant invention. Therefore instant claims 1-45 and 63-75 are anticipated by Erazo-Majewicz et al, US 2003/0211952.

In the alternative that the above disclosure is insufficient to anticipate the above listed claims, it would have nonetheless been obvious to the skilled artisan to produce the claimed composition, as the reference teaches each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions for the same utility.

Art Unit: 1751

7. Claims 1-45 and 63-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Erazo-Majewicz et al, WO 03/095497.

Erazo-Majewicz et al, WO 03/095497, discloses a personal care or household care composition comprising a cationic polygalactomannan, such as guar and locust bean, that has a molecular weight lower limit of 5,000 and an upper limit of 200,000, and an aldehyde functionality content of at least 0.01 meq/gram (see abstract, page 4, lines 24-30, and page 6, lines 12-27). It is further taught by Erazo-Majewicz et al that the cationic moiety includes quaternary ammonium compounds, such as 3-chloro-2-hydroxypropyltrimethylammonium chloride (see page 7, lines 4-21), per the requirement of claim 16, and that the composition contains adjunct ingredients typically found in personal and household care products (see page 13, line 26-page 20, line 15), per the requirements of instant claims 36-45 and 63-75. Specifically, note Tables 1-11 and Examples 1-15, which disclose compositions containing adjunct ingredients, water, and cationic polygalactomannans that meet the molecular weight, aldehyde functionality content, viscosity, and cationic degree of substitution requirements of the instant invention. Therefore instant claims 1-45 and 63-75 are anticipated by Erazo-Majewicz et al, WO 03/095497.

In the alternative that the above disclosure is insufficient to anticipate the above listed claims, it would have nonetheless been obvious to the skilled artisan to produce the claimed composition, as the reference teaches each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions for the same utility.

### ***Double Patenting***

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1-45 and 63-75 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-56 of U.S. Patent No.

7,067,499. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Erazo-Majewicz et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,067,499, claims a similar personal care or household care composition comprising water, adjunct ingredients, and a cationic polygalactomannan, such as guar and locust bean, that has a molecular weight lower limit of 5,000 and an upper limit of 200,000, and an aldehyde functionality content of at least 0.01 meq/gram, wherein the cationic polygalactomannan has similar cationic degrees of substitution and viscosities required in the instant claims

Art Unit: 1751

(see claims 1-56 of U.S. Patent No. 7,067,499). Therefore claims 1-45 and 63-75 of the instant invention are an obvious formulation in view of claims 1-56 of Erazo-Majewicz et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,067,499.

10. Claims 1-45 and 63-75 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-76 of copending Application No. 11/202,469. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because copending Application No. 11/202,469 claims a similar personal care or household care composition comprising water, adjunct ingredients, and a cationic polygalactomannan, such as guar and locust bean, that has a molecular weight lower limit of 5,000 and an upper limit of 200,000, and an aldehyde functionality content of at least 0.01 meq/gram, wherein the cationic polygalactomannan has similar cationic degrees of substitution and viscosities required in the instant claims (see claims 1-76 of copending Application No. 11/202,469). Therefore claims 1-45 and 63-75 of the instant invention are an obvious formulation in view of claims 1-76 of copending Application No. 11/202,469.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Mruk whose telephone number is (571) 272-1321. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs (7:00AM-5:30PM).



Art Unit: 1751

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BPM

Brian P Mruk  
March 6, 2007

*Brian P. Mruk*

Brian P Mruk  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1751